



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,365	04/16/2004	Chang Yeon Kim	8733.1032-US	8096
30827	7590	12/23/2008	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			MA, CALVIN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2629			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/23/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/825,365	Applicant(s) KIM ET AL.
	Examiner CALVIN C. MA	Art Unit 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2, 5-7, 13 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,13 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 13 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent 6,369,786) in view of Hashimoto (US Patent 7,113,156).

As to claim 1, Suzuki teaches an electro-luminescence display (i.e. organic EL display) (see Fig. 4, Col. 4, Lines 27-33) device, comprising:

gate lines (L1, L2 ... Ly);

data lines crossing the gate lines (i.e. the data lines S1, S2, ...Sx crosses the gate line L to form the matrix) (see Fig. 4, Col. 4, Lines 5- 20);

pixel cells (i.e. current driven display element) at crossing of the gate lines and the data lines (see Fig. 4, Col. 4, Lines 27-29);

a gate driver (1) that sequentially applies a gate signal to the gate lines during one horizontal period (i.e. the gate driver 1 applies the switching to the pixel with the action of scanning drive) (see Fig. 4, Col. 3, Lines 52-65); and

a plurality of data driving circuits (i.e. each of the current and voltage supply CS and C components in 2 and 3) that apply voltage signals to the pixel cells along a data line during a first time (T1) of within the horizontal period and apply current signals to the pixel cells during a second time (T2) within the horizontal period after the first time of the horizontal period (i.e. the first time is for Precharging voltages T1 and the second period is for current driving period T2) (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 27-40),

wherein each of the plurality of data driving circuit includes a voltage driver (5) that applies voltage signals to the data lines to pre-charge the voltage signals onto storage capacitors in the pixel cells, and a current driver (CS1) that allows the current signals corresponding to voltage signal to flow into the pixel cells (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

However, Suzuki does not explicitly teach a gamma voltage driver that generates a plurality of gamma voltage signals corresponding to image data; and applying the gamma voltage signal to flow into the pixel cells. Hashimoto teaches a gamma voltage driver that generates a plurality of gamma voltage signals corresponding to image data; and applying the gamma voltage signal to flow into the pixel cells (i.e. the plurality of gradation related voltages in applied to the driver based on gamma characteristics) (see Fig. 11, Col. 5, Lines 1-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adopted the plurality of gamma voltages generation data driving circuits of Hashimoto in the OLED driving system of Suzuki in

order to compensate for change in temperature and the change over time to improve the performance of the display system (see Hashimoto Col. 2, Lines 43-58).

As to claim 13, Suzuki teaches a method of driving an electro-luminescence display device, comprising:

applying a gate signal from a gate driver during each horizontal period to select pixel cells along specific horizontal period to pre-charge the voltage value onto a storage capacitor of the pixel cells (i.e. during the first time T1 the Precharging voltages 5 is applied and the second period is for current driving period T1 to T2) (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40); and

applying a current value corresponding to the image data to the data lines during a second time within the horizontal period after the first time (i.e. the current drive is applied after the precharge period) (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

However, Suzuki does not explicitly teach plurality of gamma voltages. Hashimoto teaches plurality of gamma voltages (i.e. the plurality of gradation related voltages in applied to the driver based on gamma characteristics) (see Fig. 11, Col. 5, Lines 1-50). Therefore, the combination of Suzuki and Hashimoto teaches the said limitations.

As to claim 2, Suzuki teaches the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 1, wherein the first time is shorter than the second time (i.e. the timing diagram

in Fig. 6 clearly shows that precharge period T1 is shorter than the voltage applying period) (see Fig. 6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

As to claim 15, Suzuki teaches the method according to claim 13, wherein the first time is less than the second time (i.e. the timing diagram in Fig. 6 clearly shows that precharge period T1 is shorter than the voltage applying period) (see Fig. 6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

3. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hashimoto as applied in claim 1 above, further in view of Ishizuka et al. (US Patent: 6,756,951)

As to claim 5, Suzuki and Hashimoto teach the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 1, wherein the voltage driver includes:

a plurality of voltage driving circuit (i.e. Voltage source 5) corresponding to each data line that generate a voltage signal corresponding to the image data (i.e. the Precharging voltage is according to the data that is to be applied) (see Fig. 4, 6, Col. 4, Line 40- Col. 5, Line 40); and

a plurality of first switches (i.e. switches C1... Cy) between each of the voltage driving and each of the data lines, wherein the first switches are turned on by a control signal (i.e. by definition the switch are controlled by a signal that control the input of the Precharging voltage) (see Fig. 4, 6, Col. 4, Line 40- Col. 5, Line 40).

However, Suzuki does not explicitly teach a block for each of the individual data voltage driving circuit. Ishizuka teaches voltage driving control block (201, 202, and 203) (see Fig. 8, Col. 8, Lines 8-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the modular control design of Ishizuka in the overall display design of Suzuki, since more data driving circuit make the display panel uniform (See Ishizuka Col.3, Lines 1-4).

As to claim 6, Suzuki and Hashimoto teach the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 5, wherein said current driver includes:

a plurality of current driving circuit (CS1...CSx) corresponding to each data lines applying the current signal corresponding to the plurality of gamma voltage signals (see Hashimoto, Fig. 11), said current driving circuit having 1 subgroups; and a plurality of second switches (S1...Sx) between each of the current driving circuit and each of the data lines and wherein the second switches are turned on by a control signal (i.e. since the current driving circuit feed each data line according to the control signal controlling S based on the image data they form display components dedicated for each line) (see Suzuki, Fig. 4, 6, Col. 4, Line 40- Col. 5, Line 40).

As to claim 7, Suzuki teaches the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 6, wherein the control signal remains at a first level during the first time (T1)

and remaining at second level during the second time (T2) (see Fig. 6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 13,15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CALVIN C. MA whose telephone number is (571)270-1713. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Calvin Ma
December 18, 2008

/Chanh Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629